

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ROBERT HOLLAND,	:	No. 1:24cv1501
Plaintiff	:	
	:	(Judge Munley)
v.	:	
	:	(Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)
CITY OF YORK, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
Defendants	:	

.....

14th **ORDER**

AND NOW, to wit, this 14th day of April 2025, before the court for disposition is Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle's report and recommendation, which proposes granting the City of York's motion to dismiss and the dismissal of the plaintiff's complaint in its entirety with prejudice. (Doc. 27). No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed, and the time for such filing has passed. Therefore, in deciding whether to adopt the report and recommendation, the court must determine if a review of the record evidences plain error or manifest injustice. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) 1983 Advisory Committee Notes ("When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record to accept the recommendation"); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Sullivan v. Cuyler, 723 F.2d 1077, 1085 (3d Cir. 1983).

After a careful review, the court finds neither a clear error on the face of the record nor a manifest injustice, and therefore, the report and recommendation shall be adopted. It is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1) The magistrate judge's report and recommendation (Doc. 27) is **ADOPTED**;

2) The City of York's motion to dismiss (Doc. 15) is **GRANTED**;

3) The plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** in its entirety with prejudice; and

4) The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

BY THE COURT:



JUDGE JULIA K. MUNLEY
United States District Court